

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

The Hamilton County Board of Commissioners met on Monday, July 12, 2004. The Commissioners walked through the Auditor's office to view the proposed relocation of Human Resources. The Commissioners met in Executive Session in Conference Room 1A from 1:40 p.m. to 2:05 p.m. President Dillinger called the public meeting to order and declared a quorum present of Commissioner Christine Altman, Commissioner Steven C. Dillinger and Commissioner Steven A. Holt. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Approval of Minutes: [2:10:34]

Holt motioned to approve the June 28, 2004 minutes. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Executive Session Memoranda:

Holt motioned to approve the July 12, 2004 Executive Session Memoranda. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Highway Business [2:11:03]

Road Cut Permits:

Mr. Jim Neal requested approval of Open Road Cut Permits. 1) RDCUT 2004-019 - Vectren Energy Delivery at 101st and Carrollton for maintenance to gas valve. 2) RDCUT 2004-0022 - Valenti-Held Contractor 2165' west of Towne Road on 141st Street for storm sewer crossing. 3) RDCUT 2004-0023 - Valenti-Held Contractor 18' south of Towne Road for storm sewer crossing. 4) RDCUT 2004-024 - Dotlich Contractors 164' south of Orchard Park Drive West on Orchard Park Drive South to repair sanitary sewer main. Work completed as an emergency. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Acceptance of Bonds/Letters of Credit - Highway Department:

Mr. Neal requested acceptance of Bonds and Letters of Credit for the highway department. 1) HCHD #B-03-0082 - Western Surety Company Continuation Certificate for Bond No. 14509296 issued on behalf of Valenti-Held Contractor/Developer, Inc. in the sum of \$5,000 to expire July 24, 2005. 2) HCHD #B-04-0059 - Merchants Bonding Company Permit Bond No. IN 14129 issued on behalf of REI Real Estate Services, LLC in the sum of \$5,000 for work in r/w for storm sewer and erosion control of Goddard School to expire June 1, 2005. 3) HCHD #B-04-0060 - Merchants Bonding Company Permit Bond No. INC 2228 issued on behalf of REI Real Estate Services, LLC in the sum of \$5,000 for work completed in r/w for storm sewer and erosion control of Goddard School to expire June 15, 2005. 4) HCHD #B-04-0061 - Auto-Owners Insurance Company Permit Bond No. 006573 issued on behalf of Filson Earthwork Co., Inc. in the sum of \$10,000 for drive permit at 21785 Riverwood Avenue to expire June 25, 2005. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously. 5) HCHD #B-04-0062 - Capitol Indemnity Corporation Permit Bond No. 625118 issued on behalf of Oles Engineering Corp. in the sum of \$5,000 for a directional bore under Spring Mill Road north of 169th Street to expire June 29, 2005. 6) HCHD #B-04-0063 - Bond Safeguard Performance Bond No. 5012143 issued on behalf of infrastructure Contractors, Inc. in the sum of \$113,500 for asphalt and curbs in Vintage Woods, Section 2 to expire June 29, 2006. 7) HCHD #B-04-0064 - St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company Payment Bond No. 400SV2290 issued on behalf of Beaty Construction, Inc. in the sum of \$181,404 for Bridge No. 182, 131st Street over Sand Creek, to expire July 6, 2006. 8) HCHD #B-04-0065 - St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company Performance Bond No. 400SV2290 issued on behalf of Beaty Construction, Inc. in the sum of \$181,404 for Bridge No. 182, 131st Street over Sand Creek, to expire July 6, 2006. 9) HCHD #B-04-0066 - Fidelity and Deposit Company Performance Bond issued on behalf of Erber & Milligan Construction Company, Inc. in the sum of \$175,512.85 for Bridge #134 to expire July 1, 2006. 10) HCHD #B-04-0067 - Fidelity and Deposit Company Payment Bond issued on behalf of Erber and Milligan Construction Company, Inc. in the sum of \$175,512.85 for Bridge #134 to expire July 1, 2006. 11) HCHD #B-04-0067 - Fidelity and Deposit Company Payment Bond issued on behalf of Erber and Milligan Construction Company, Inc. In the sum of \$175,512.85 for Resurface Contract 04-6 to expire July 1, 2006. 12) HCDH #B-04-0069 - St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company Payment Bond issued on behalf of E&B Paving, Inc. in the sum of \$141,099.70 for Resurface Contract 04-6 to expire July 1, 2006. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Release of Bonds/Letters of Credit - Highway Department:

Mr. Neal requested the approval of the release of a Bond for the highway department. 1) HCHD #B-02-0068 - Travelers Casualty and Surety Company Bond No. 27S103510285BCM issued on behalf of Glendale Partners of West Carmel, LLC for work in Carwinion Way. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Agreements

Subdivision Inspection Agreement: [2:12:29]

Vintage Woods Subdivision, Section 2:

Mr. Neal requested approval of a Subdivision Inspection Agreement, HCHD #A-04-0012, for Vintage Woods Subdivision, Section 2. The agreement is between Hamilton County and Vintage Development, Inc. (developer) and United Consulting Engineers (engineer) in a not to exceed amount of \$7,000. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Official Actions [2:13:13]

113th Street and Ringer Road:

Mr. Neal requested approval of an official action to install No Parking regulatory signs on 113th Street and Ringer Road in the vicinity of Bridge #193. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Correspondence [2:13:59]

Road Closures:

Mr. Neal requested approval of proposed road closures. 1) 131st Street between Promise Road and Marilyn Road beginning Monday, July 12, 2004 through Tuesday, August 17, 2004 for widening of Bridge #182. 2) 104th Street between Olio Road and Georgia Road beginning Thursday, July 8, 2004 through Friday, August 12, 2004 for improvements to 104th Street at Olio Road. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Bridge Consultant Selection:

Mr. Neal requested selection of a consultant for two bridge and two small structures. Altman motioned to table for review. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

US 31 Upgrade:

Mr. Brad Davis presented information on the US 31 upgrade. Mr. Davis stated there is not a deadline for comments, but would like to have them as soon as possible as they are going to final design. Mr. Davis stated the highway department has reviewed the upgrade. They would like to see some of the side access roads improved as part

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

of the project or in some way done with the project. The area would be between 146th Street and 151st on the west side of US 31, Western Way. On the east side of US 31 the connection from the county exit ramp on 146th Street, where it connects taking it up behind the Village Park Plaza up to 151st Street. These were considered alternatives to the upgrade plan but were dropped when it came to this revision. These improvements would help traffic flow. Another comment is people going northbound on Rangeline Road will end up going through two roundabouts on the west side of US 31 to get to 146th Street. The highway department would like to see the frontage road that is parallel to US 31 extended and connect to the county's exit ramp south of 146th Street. People going northbound will not have to go through the shopping area, get on 146th Street and cross an already congested area. Discussion followed. Altman asked the highway department to prepare the discussed alternates to see if they are feasible.

County Highway Surplus Property Auction:

Mr. Davis requested approval to use the Hamilton County 4H Fairgrounds on Saturday, September 25, 2004 for the county highway surplus property auction and to use Baker Auction as the auctioneer. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance 6-14-04-A, Subdivision Plat Submittal:

Mr. Mike Howard present Ordinance 6-14-04-A, requiring developers to subdivision plats in digital format to the Auditor's office. One of the issues was that the developers and engineers had an opportunity to comment on this ordinance. It is his understanding from the Auditor that there have been no negative comments. Altman stated her concern was that in almost every jurisdiction in the county, if you have one lot and you own contiguous land you will not be allowed to split, so it won't be exempt under the split statute they will make you subdivide it. Altman stated we need an exclusion in the ordinance for plots that are three or fewer. [2:38:15] Mr. Howard stated he did ask Melissa Dashiell about adding a provision concerning small platted subdivisions, for residential plats she would agree. For commercial plats they would have to be submitted digitally. Mr. Howard suggested adding "the terms of this ordinance are optional for residential platted subdivision of three or fewer lots". Altman stated with that amendment she motioned to adopt Ordinance 6-14-04-A. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Committee Reports [2:29:22]

RTA Appointment:

Altman stated the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has started a Regional Transit Authority (RTA). It passed by ordinance in Marion County, which was the precursor. Part of that ordinance was an appointment of the surrounding counties of a person to the RTA. They are asking for the appointments to be done in July. The RTA has no outside funding mechanism, but we are trying to coordinate that with the MPO appointments. Altman stated she would be willing to serve on the RTA. Holt motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Small Particulate Matter: [2:31:15]

Altman stated if anyone in the county has issues with the small particulate matter, we are proposed by the EPA to be a non-compliant county. The States' response, through IDEM, is that we have ozone that we are not in attainment in and we have dust particles. Under IDEM we are a county in compliance because we have no monitoring. The particular effect is that if we are non-compliant because we are in the Marion County region, then we will have to go through the same planning we are doing currently for ozone standard to come up with a mitigation plan or a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that will have to be approved and finalized by 2008 and reduction in small particulate matter by 2010. The EPA has not had a final ruling. There will be severe economic impacts with what we will have to do to reduce that particulate matter. It would be best if Hamilton County was not included in the Marion County region. Altman motioned that the Commissioners write a letter to the EPA and the Governor supporting IDEM's position. Any other support we could get would be helpful. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Holt asked if we should send a letter to IDEM thanking them for their support? Altman stated yes, it would be appropriate. Holt asked Mr. Swift to write the letters. Holt asked if the commissioners would like to copy each executive of each municipality so they know the county is weighing in and maybe it would be a catalyst for each of them to weigh in as well? Altman stated that would be appropriate. Altman asked the Hamilton County Alliance to be included.

Altman stated the MPO has requested a special meeting with the northern region, including Hamilton County. Their modeling has not shown anything different on ridership. The meeting is July 19, 2004 at 9:30 am in Fishers. Altman has expressed her concerns to the MPO which is putting in the rapid transit on a branch in Marion County that is on the west side near downtown. There already is bus service there. The modeling may show ridership, if those people are not currently using the bus system which is there now, what makes them think it will change with that? We have demonstrated traffic conditions that will force ridership on our leg. As indicated with the ozone issues and particulate matter we have to do something to reduce congestion that is already on the roadways. Hopefully Fishers will have someone at that meeting as well as the Mayor of Carmel and they will express similar concerns. The major issue is if we will have the starter system coming up to the northeast corridor to relieve the congestion on I-69 or will it start out with IUPUI.

Request for Accident Response: [2:40:15]

Mr. Richard Albright, 12409 Lancelot Lane, Carmel. Mr. Albright asked why the commissioners have not responded to his letters concerning his claims for damages resulting from his accident on 146th Street on December 12, 2003. Mr. Albright requested the commissioners positive consideration for his claim. Mr. Albright stated an initial letter was sent to the commissioners on February 9, 2004. "A claim was submitted for damages caused by negligence by the part of Hamilton County that resulted in damaging (his) car beyond repair and having (his) wife strapped on a board and taken to the hospital." The commissioners had no response to his letters. Mr. Albright stated Hamilton County was negligent in not marking the island he struck, as required, and in not shaping the end of the island according to recognized standards to avoid damage. Mr. Albright stated he wrote a follow-up letter with initial estimates of costs on March 5th with no response from the commissioners. In May he received a letter from an insurance representative in Texas with no knowledge of the circumstances and with a mis-statement of facts, who wrote a convoluted denial of his claim. An attempt to reach the insurance representative by phone brought no response. Mr. Albright wrote a third letter to the commissioners on May 11, 2004 informing them of his rejection of her denial of his claim and of the factual errors in her letter. There was still no response from the commissioners. Mr. Albright stated he then contacted Fred Swift who agreed to look in to the status of his claim. Mr. Swift eventually advised Mr. Albright to contact the insurance representative and to call Mike Howard, who he said was handling his case. Mr. Albright finally spoke to the women in Texas, who confirmed her complete lack of knowledge of road conditions and your responsibility to know how to construct and mark the island properly to protect the public. Mr. Albright stated he called Mike Howard on June 25th with no response from Mr. Howard. Mr. Albright stated he requested to be placed on

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

the agenda to complain about the commissioners “total disregard of a legitimate claim by a citizen of Hamilton County, about your lack of common courtesy and your obvious cavalier attitudes that are most unbecoming of public officials.”

Mr. Albright as for the claim itself, as he was preparing to make a left turn while eastbound on 146th Street he shifted lanes and immediately struck an unmarked island at the end of a long left turn lane just east of the intersection with Drayton. The island was not properly designed, constructed, or marked to prevent vehicles from striking it and to minimize damage to any vehicle that might strike it. The knowledge of how to design construct and mark islands is clearly spelled out in the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the AASHTO “Green Book”. Your obligation to mark the island in conformance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is clearly spelled out in Indiana Code 9-21-4-1. Your obligation to design and construct the road to the highest safety standards should not be questioned. 146th Street was not designed or constructed on the cheap by amateurs. Your belated efforts to install markers on all islands along 146th Street since the accident is an admission that the islands must be marked, but they still do not comply with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Mr. Albright asked if the Commissioners are going to give meaningful consideration to his claim and take positive action or whether you prefer that he take the next action to receive compensation for losses and lost time in pursuing this matter. He would like compensation for damages, lost time and a statement acknowledging that the island was not marked as required by the Indiana code.

Mr. Howard stated Mr. Albright filed a Tort Claim with the county, it was forwarded to the insurance carrier. The carrier has the duty to handle it at that time. Dillinger stated the insurance carrier gave consideration and denied the claim. Mr. Albright stated the carrier wrote him a letter saying that he was off the road, which he was not. They said he was not in control of the vehicle, which he was because he deliberately moved in to the left turn lane to make a left turn. The left turn lane ended abruptly with a an unmarked island and a concrete curb. Mr. Albright stated he does not know what the woman in Texas knows about 146th Street. Dillinger stated he is sorry that Mr. Albright feels we have ignored him. Having been our County Engineer you know that claims are not something that this Board deals with. We hire claims people and insurance companies to do that. The system is that if you don’t like their decision, then you need to carry it to the next step, we are not the next step. Mr. Albright stated as public officials when someone communicates with you, you have some sort of a duty to respond or at least acknowledge receipt of the claim. Dillinger stated not with the potential of litigation. Mr. Albright stated then you turn it over to somebody who has a direct conflict of interest. The lady in Texas has no idea what Indiana law says about marking islands, she made a claim that if no one had complained about it before, the county had no obligation to correct the problem. If the road were 20 years old with a problem, that is one thing. This is a brand new multi-lane highway. Altman stated there is obviously a difference in opinion as to fault and contribution that we are not going to be able to resolve here. It needs to be resolved at the next step with the next forum. That is our obligation to the taxpayers, just as we have an obligation to you. We have a difference of opinion as to what the facts are and the logical approach is to have an impartial forum determine who should prevail on that. At this point that is your option, if you care to pursue it further. Our initial review of the claim did not meet the standards of compensation on our level or the carrier’s level. If you disagree, the next step is to have the courts decide who is correct. Mr. Howard stated that is why we have insurance, to say we are turning it over to someone that has a conflict of interest is a total contradiction of the total reality of the world. We have insurance and if there is a claim against you for liability you turn it over to your insurance company. If you do not turn it over and do not give the insurance company an opportunity to investigate and do what they do, then you do not have coverage. We turned it over to the insurance carrier, their investigation may have not met your standards, but they did comply with the essential elements of their contractual policy with us and that is where it ends. Mr. Albright stated two months ago he wrote to this body and stated he did not agree with that. It was a complete stonewalling. Mr. Albright stated he did not think that was right, he thinks he deserves some response. Mr. Howard stated this forum is not the forum to adjudicate liability claims. Dillinger stated it is inappropriate for us to intervene with our insurance company, which we pay to examine those claims and the potential litigation that come from that. Yes, we have an obligation to you but we also have an obligation to the other 230,000 taxpayers of Hamilton County. Dillinger stated we can not resolve this. We can not over rule the insurance carrier. Mr. Albright stated he has consulted with INDOT, Purdue, federal highway administration, looked up Indiana statutes and he thinks he is on pretty firm ground. Mr. Albright stated what you are saying is that you will not go any farther and it is up to me if I want to initiate litigation? Dillinger stated that is correct.

Attorney [2:53:34]

Liability Trust Claim:

Mr. Howard requested approval of a Liability Trust Claim payable to Midland National Life Insurance in the amount of \$86,111.00. This will conclude the Ann Davidson issue. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Altman and Holt approved. Dillinger abstained, disclosing he is not the insurance agent on this claim, but he does represent Midland National Life. Motion carried unanimously.

Altman asked Mr. Howard to review the issue of splitting the funding on the mental health association.

Envoy Project Update [2:54:54]

Juvenile Detention Center:

Mr. John Barbee stated the site work phase of the Juvenile Detention Center project is about 40% complete. The fill coming over from SR 37 is approximately 1/3 complete. We are on schedule for completion in late September. The construction document design phase is approximately 90% complete, with completion in July. Bids will be sent August 11, 2004 and we are tentatively receiving bids September 8, 2004. That will be finalized August 4 with a work session with the county council, dependent on their approval of sale of bonds. Altman asked if we have approved final plans? Mr. Barbee stated the design development plans have been approved by the commissioners. The construction document plans will be completed at the end of July and will come before the commissioners for approval prior to September 11th. Altman stated she would like to have those plans well in advance of the meeting for review. Altman motioned to consider the plans within the statutory realm of security documents that are exempt from public information laws. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Howard stated plans should be to the commissioners during their August 26th Executive Session. Mr. Barbee stated he expects to have 20 bid packages and it will not be necessary to open during a commissioners meeting. They will need to be opened in public. Altman stated she does not want the same issue that we had over the electrical. They will be concise to the bid as advertised. Mr. Dawson stated those documents will be public for bid. They will not be held in strict confidence during bidding. Altman stated maybe we need to look at confidentiality and non-disclosure in the bid documents. Mr. Howard stated confidentiality would be in the bid documents and only release to known contractors. Mr. Dawson stated he does not

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

like the idea of restricting the bidders on the project, we want the highest amount of bidders we can get. He does not know how to protect the security through the language. Mr. Howard stated we can have the people who pick up bids sign a confidentiality agreement. Mr. Howard asked who hands out the documents? Mr. Dawson stated Advantage Documents Services hands out the documents and receives the deposit. Mr. Howard asked if they know who legitimate contractors are? Mr. Dawson stated no. Altman stated then they should not be handing out the documents on this type of project. Mr. Dawson stated whatever we work out needs Mr. Howard's approval of the legalities for bidding a state job. Mr. Howard stated that is not difficult. Dillinger asked how do they do this when they are building prisons? Mr. Dawson stated just as we are doing. Dillinger stated he does not want to restrict bidders. Altman stated the only restriction is that you have to be a qualified bidder. A qualified bidder is a person that has experience in that area that is a person that can feasibly bid. A confidentiality agreement is typical in business. This is a normal business plan that we should begin to look at for security issues. It is not anti-competitive. Mr. Howard asked if the bids could be opened at some time other than a Commissioners meeting. It will be a public meeting. Mr. Barbee stated it is tentatively scheduled for September 8, 2004.

Mr. Dawson stated through the work of Jeff Marcum, Dan Stevens, Sheriff Carter and a psychologist that is working with them, they brought up the possibility that they would sometimes like the ability to put more than one child in a secure environment and not have them be alone. They ask for that to happen. The Sheriff's group that operates the Juvenile Detention Center have agreed that sometimes the psychologist does request that and further investigation was done by them of what the final restrictive requirements were against any type of double bunking. We have found that we can have a limited number of double bunking in the facility, we have the option on our own for double bunking up to 20% of the facility. If we chose that option it could totally replace the need for the foreseeable future for the fourth pod. We had talked about bidding the fourth pod as an alternate. Mr. Dawson's recommendation for the sake of approximately \$1 million, he would like to pursue the double bunking strategy as opposed to the fourth pod strategy. We don't think we have an immediate need for the fourth pod in the foreseeable future, if we follow the double bunking procedure. Mr. Dawson requested permission to pursue that bidding strategy. If you want to leave the fourth pod in, he would like to bid it completely as an alternate. Altman stated she sees no reason why we would not pursue the double bunking regardless of whether we do the fourth pod as an add alternate. The double bunking makes sense. She would still like to see the fourth pod as an alternate to make the decision when we review bids. Holt agreed. Holt motioned to include double bunking in our plans, that it not be an alternate that it be what we do. Holt stated he does not see a problem with bidding the fourth pod shell as an alternate. Altman seconded. Sheriff Carter stated the original direction he received from the Board was to maximize the facility. Sheriff Carter stated he sees a need to maximize the jail side as well as successful completion of the JDC. It seems to be a good alternative, considering the amount of time it would take for the building to be maximized. A more important need will be to maximize the jail building as well. This is a reasonable alternative, to complete the JDC project as well as maximizing the existing jail. Dillinger stated to double bunk and not build the fourth pod shell? Sheriff Carter stated correct. The alternate that Mr. Dawson is proposing is a good option. Motion carried unanimously.

[3:08:41] Mr. Dawson stated we started looking at the jail. One scope of the project is to look at the interior kitchen, laundry and medical space. Others would like to see an expansion of the jail and locate Emergency Management in the Jail. Mr. Dawson stated if we want to go through a total scoping and preliminary design so we can turn in cost estimates, RQAW has proposed an additional \$150,000 to perform that work. Mr. Dawson stated they believe the money for the design work is currently available in the project that we currently have, out of the first \$2.5 million for design. We have not had many changes in those budgets. The money is there and unspent. Funding should not be any problem. Parts of this will fit in to the Juvenile Detention Center, especially the parts with medical, kitchen, etc. Mr. Dawson requested to be placed on the meeting agenda for this review and to give a financial update on the \$2.5 million budget and the \$3 million budget, which are advances against the bond sale. Both budgets are in great shape.

Mr. Dawson stated they are on hold on the Prosecutor's relocation, Planning Department, Personnel and Safety Risk Management relocations. We are also on hold for the Animal Control facility.

Mr. Howard stated Altman has requested to see the plans in advance of approving them, when looking at the bid schedule the next time to approve the plans is at the July 26th meeting. Mr. Howard stated it is his understanding that the front section of the plans could be available by Friday, would that give Ms. Altman time to review them before the next meeting. Altman asked how close will things be specked out? Altman stated as long as she knows it is being specked out in the most economical manner for the county. Mr. Barbee stated the specs along with the construction documents are about 75% done. He can get what is completed and general plans to Altman by Friday. Mr. Dawson stated they will make the plans available in their office for the commissioners review at any time. Holt stated the underlying philosophy is that it is our intention that it not be a monument to anyone's ego, this is to be a functional, efficient, low cost project. Mr. Dawson stated Jeff Marcum, Dan Stevens and the Sheriff have been reviewing the projects weekly and anything found like that has been changed.

Holt stated he is fine waiting two weeks for an answer on the RQAW proposal for the jail, could we get a thumbnail of any down side of approving this? Mr. Dawson stated then we would not have a scope for the jail portion of the project. If there is going to be a jail portion of the project, then we need to bid the juvenile center, then whatever monies are available out of the bond sale that are directly attributable to the juvenile center, such as food service, laundry, medical care, we would like to get that designed quickly and bid it among the same contractors. The down side is that we would not be able to do the things that we thought would be needed as expansion to the jail to accommodate the juvenile detention center. Mr. Howard stated this is being funded through a lease, we already have a lease on the Sheriff's Department. We can fund improvements on the leased premises and improvements and infrastructure that benefit that leased premises, such as sewers, off-site dirt, kitchen improvements, things on the other site. After that the line gets tenuous as to what benefits the leased benefits. The safer recourse is to get an idea of what might be needed and if there is contingency money left, then it can be used. To call it the same project it tenuous, from a legal standpoint. Mr. Dawson stated there is a second pot of money that might be available through the jail fund, if Mr. Howard tells us that some things don't qualify under the bond sale. It seems wise to us to know what the parameters are that we could do in the jail project that coordinates, if the money is available. Mr. Howard suggested those components that are expansion related you may want to move on today. The rest of the components set aside until we see the balance of the budget. Altman asked Sheriff Carter if he is happy with this number? Sheriff Carter stated yes. Altman asked how many other designers have you talked to? Sheriff Carter stated he has only talked with Joe Mrak. Altman stated it seems like a salty number for what we are getting. Altman would like a chance to look at it a little longer. Mr. Dawson asked what is the estimated size of the project? Mr. Dawson stated approximately \$3.5 to

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

\$4 million. If they do everything requested. The portion of the building to accommodate the juvenile center and the interior space to improve the services on the inside of the jail was approximately \$1 million. Now we have expansion around the entire building. The juvenile portion is about 1/3 to 1/4 of that size. The request was made of RQAW to turn in a fee for the scope that they were developing with the users. We can go back and ask for a design fee only for those things associated with the juvenile detention center. We are not expecting to get approval today. Holt motioned to approve the proposal and ask RQAW to go forward. Dillinger seconded. Holt and Dillinger approved. Altman opposed. Motion carries.

Mr. Dawson stated the Council has requested a financial update on the \$2.5 million and \$3 million budgets at their August 4th meeting. Altman asked Mr. Dawson to present that update. Mr. Dawson stated they will furnish the Commissioners copies of the update at the next meeting.

Guaranteed Energy Savings: [3:24:28]

Mr. David Wrightsman, Energy Savings Group, Mr. Wrightsman asked if the commissioners have received any presentations in the past on guaranteed energy savings projects? Holt stated we did when we built the Judicial Center. Mr Wrightsman asked if you moved forward with any recommendations? Holt stated he thinks we accepted all of them. Mr. Wrightsman asked if that was through an energy service company where you financed the projects and realized savings over the term or was it an alternative to your traditional construction project? Holt stated it was the latter. Mr. Wrightsman stated Guaranteed Energy Savings was legislation that was put in to effect in 1996, it was an enhancement of 1994 legislation for schools that gave them an alternative method to procure upgrades to their facilities. This is an alternative system of procurement, rather than bid spec; it allows you some creative financing to do some things without capital; and realize savings over time. It is a Request for Proposal process. It requires you to go out for proposals, but lets you take the best value, not necessarily the lowest price. It is competitive in that way. The idea is that as an energy service company will audit your facilities and come up with a list of recommendations. No capital, no commitment is done until you enter into a contract. The upgrades are financed over time through an operating lease. The maximum to use the finance is 10 years. Benefits of the program are the guarantee and the price. It transfers the risk of construction to the energy service provider who is financially invested to make sure all of the designs work as intended and produce the economic benefit. Some examples that the projects can do is anything that can save a kilowatt of electricity or a BTU of gas. Lighting, heating and air conditioning, windows, doors, roofing, etc. We have expanded to wastewater treatment plants, traffic lights a variety of interesting technologies to reduce cost and upgrade environment for staff and customers. Dillinger suggested Mr. Wrightsman contact Scott Warner, Buildings and Grounds Superintendent.

Dillinger called a break in the meeting. [3:29:59]

Dillinger called the meeting back to order. [3:53:34]

Administrative Assistant

Law Library:

Mr. Fred Swift stated Polly Pearce has written to the Noblesville Public Library asking if they would like to house the law library. They have not committed, but are considering taking the law library. Altman stated she thought the understanding was that the Judges, at their next meeting, would discuss our proposal and come up with their own proposal. **Circle 7 Workforce Development Appointment:**

Holt motioned to re-appoint David Redden to the Circle 7 Workforce Development. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Health Board Appointment:

Altman motioned to appoint Laurie Pylitt to the Hamilton County Board of Health. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Hamilton East Public Library Board Appointment:

Holt motioned to re-appoint Lyneen Burrow to the Hamilton East Library Board. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Auditor [3:58:26]

Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Agreement:

Ms. Robin Mills requested approval of the annual contract with the Indiana State Board of Animal Health for Bovine Brucellosis and Tuberculosis Eradication. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Maximus Agreement:

Ms. Mills requested approval of the Maximus Agreement. Mr. Howard stated he has reviewed the agreement and the Bobbie Huskey proposal, it could be a conflict but most of the Maximus agreement is looking to see existing, in-place revenue streams where Huskey is looking for new opportunities. Altman motioned to approve the Maximus contract. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Capital Asset Notifications:

Altman motioned to approve Capital Asset Notification forms (3) submitted by the Parks Department. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Liability Trust Claims:

Ms. Mills requested approval of Liability Trust Claims: 1) Hartford Speciality - \$1,679.05 from an automobile on SR 38 that caused damage to a home. Dillinger stated the report states the homeowner was negligent. If they are responsible, why are we paying the claim? Holt motioned to table and let Mr. Howard investigate the claim. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. 2) Integrator.com Division - \$2,786.50 for lighting damage to a cell tower. Altman motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2005 Commissioners Meeting Schedule:

Ms. Mills requested approval of the 2005 Commissioners meeting schedule. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Acceptance of Bonds/Letters of Credit - Drainage Board:

Ms. Mills requested acceptance of a Bond for the drainage board. 1) HCDB-2004-00050 - Merchants Bonding Company Performance Bond No. INC 2029 for Goddard School, Crooked Creek Drain for storm sewers and erosion control in the amount of \$3,000. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Payroll Claims:

Ms. Mills requested approval of the Payroll Claims for the period of June 21 thru July 4, 2004 to be paid July 16, 2004. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

Vendor Claims:

Ms. Mills requested approval of the Vendor Claims to be paid July 13, 2004. Holt motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dillinger called a recess in the meeting. [4:06:37]

Dillinger called the meeting back to order. [4:33:29]

Animal Control: [4:33:32]

Mr. David Sanders, Hamilton County Humane Society, stated the society does not have anything new to offer the commissioners today. “ We are here in anticipation of what you are going to decide. We hope the commissioners approve the shelter run as it is now, with the Humane Society managing the shelter and the Animal Control Officers (ACO) continuing as it is now. The county officer will be a euthanasia officer if necessary. The only caveat we are concerned with is that we understand that animals will be euthanized. Our concern is the humaneness in which that is done. If that option is viable, we would like to discuss it further. Dillinger asked if there is a state prescribed way to do that?” Mr. Sanders stated the way we do it will probably differ from the way the county may do it. Dr. Nichols stated the concern from the staff is how the animals will be handled to get to that process. The staff has recommended that we continue to be the ones responsible in terms of euthanasia. If there is only one person that is handling the animal and how they are going to do that so it is safe for them as well as the animal is a concern. Based on staff response, the Humane Society will continue to take on that responsibility. This would be a savings to the county because you would not have to pay for a county employee. Dillinger stated he thought that is against your policy? Mr. Sanders stated they are not flip-flopping on their policy, we have found some new avenues and processes that we can adopt more animals. Our whole purpose it to try and get the animals out of there without euthanizing them. Dillinger stated that is fine, we are not big on euthanasia and want it only when necessary. Dillinger stated this has been going on a long time and he would like it to come to conclusion today so we can move forward. The proposals the county made were that a county person will perform the euthanizing and the other proposal was that the county would handle the intake, provide the statutory obligations for animal control and then turn them over to the Humane Society. If you did not have room then the county would deal with it. Did you discuss this with the Humane Society Board? Mr. Sanders stated yes. We would wish for Commissioner Holt’s option. We are handling all the strays coming in, theoretically we are talking about a building cut in half for two entities. In realistic terms we don’t think that will work. The county will need so much more space and the Humane Society space would continue to get smaller and that is what we are afraid of. Dillinger asked if you addressed the issue of not turning any animal away? Mr. Sanders stated yes. The Humane Society is prepared to meet that obligation, with a new building. We understand that is what the county has to do and we are ready to accept that. That puts a lot of burden on the Humane Society. We will have to come up with various and new ways to adopt animals out. Dillinger stated he is confused, he thought Mr. Sanders stated he agreed to Holt’s idea of county personnel for the euthanasia and Dr. Nichols stated they would not do that. Dr. Nichols stated he did not say they would not do that, the staff is concerned about how the animals were dealt with and they would prefer that they were the ones administering the euthanasia solution, they were the ones responsible for that verses a county employee who may not be vested in that animal as they would be. Dillinger asked if that violates your policy? Dr. Nichols stated our concern is euthanizing for space, we are talking about is trying to make the effort that we don’t ever have to do that. Whether or not that is realistic or not, only time will tell. We are prepared and the staff is prepared to deal with that type of situation if it comes to that. If we have to make choices on animals that have been there for long periods of time, to open up a spot for another animal to come in, then we will do that. It is not a preference to euthanize for space and it is not our choice to do that. The concern was that if we have a county person, not vested in the animals, how well they would deal with those animals in that setting. Altman asked if they are looking at long-term permanent adoption in what you are trying to create? Mr. Sanders stated yes. Altman asked in county or out of county? Mr. Sanders stated both. Altman stated she wants to make sure we are not shifting our responsibility. Mr. Sanders stated there are areas of Wisconsin that have no dogs to adopt and they are willing to take all of the animals we can give them. Dillinger asked if they discussed the ideas that Susan Jennings proposed about vet technicians doing some things out there? Mr. Sanders stated that would be great. We would like to expand our educational programs for the community, we would like to expand spay-neuter. We are so cramped right now. This decision needs to be dealt with first and then we can progress. Dr. Nichols stated our concern is trying to get as much space for the dollar we have. To maximize that we may have to cut out in terms of space and not facilitate those programs and look to the future to add on. Wherever we are at we need to make sure we have some area to expand to allow us to do those type of things in the future, if we can’t do them right away. Dillinger stated he knows an effort has been in visiting other facilities and coming back with a lot of ideas. The general consensus of people that he talks to is that we don’t need to make this a Taj Mahal, so to speak. We need to build the most for our money and be able to accomodate this situation is what we should do. Mr. Sanders stated he agrees. Dillinger stated he has not seen the plans, he has heard about them and he does not think it will work. Altman stated she would like to sit down with the designers and see what we have to start with and have them explain their concept and move on with the design and building of that facility. Holt stated he would like to hear from the municipalities that are in attendance today.

[4:45:17] Mr. Howard stated based on the current agreement with the Humane Society, the county has entered in to agreements with the cities and towns that animals will be received at the facility in two groups, 1) strays defined as non-owner animals and 2) animals that officers bring in. The county has a contract with the underlying units that we will do that because the county has a contract with the Humane Society. Is he to understand that as of today, you will be accepting those animals? If not, we will need to renegotiate the agreement? Mr. Sanders stated our contract states that we are responsible for all strays, regardless if they come in from an individual or an ACO. We are respecting that contract and we do take all of those animals. We are busting at the seams. The animals we are turning away are the owner releases. We are living up to our contract. We need to go one step further and take the owner release animals. That way we will be taking all the animals from the county and that is what we intend on doing. We feel we have avenues to get these animals gone. Noblesville Mayor Ditslear stated we appreciate the fact that you do take animals that the officers bring in. He is assuming that we have not had officers refused. We have a question about the cost. We have a contract before us that we have not passed. We have agreed to pay the terms under the current contract. Ditslear stated he would think that anyone within the City of Noblesville could take a stray animal, not involve our police officers and take them to a facility and they would be accepted at that facility. Dillinger stated that is one of our requirements. Ditslear stated he is not familiar with any educational processes from the Humane Society. Ditslear asked if there is a location for the new facility, what size, etc.? Dillinger stated we have preliminary designs and the designated location is on Pleasant Street, where the old highway department was located. It is important to the commissioners to know that the municipalities will buy in to the contract. Altman stated the county’s contract with the

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

Humane Society states that we pay per animal, we pay for an officer bringing in an animal and we pay for individuals within the jurisdiction that drop off a stray. It is critical that Noblesville is in with our contract or you will need to cut your own contract with the Humane Society. Right now, unless we are reimbursed from Noblesville for the animals that your citizens bring to the Humane Society as strays, we are being billed and are not being reimbursed and that is not acceptable. Either you can negotiate your own deal with the Humane Society or come under our umbrella and the county does the billing, reimbursement and lets you know. Mayor Ditslear stated he respects that, they are a team player and whatever we can do together has to be more cost effective. We want to continue with that. Dillinger clarified that Noblesville wants to continue but look at the cost portion? Mayor Ditslear stated if those commitments can be retained and maintained, then we are in favor of that. Mayor Ditslear stated he does appreciate the practicalities of how big this facility has to be and he is excited that there is an outlet in Wisconsin for animals. He thinks it is great that they have a more aggressive adoption and spay-neuter opportunity.

[4:54:39] Tim Green, Assistant Carmel Police Chief, stated the proposed agreement between the county and the city is due to have action taken by the Carmel City Council on July 19, 2004. Dillinger asked if that means that Carmel will continue to participate? Mr. Green stated based on his knowledge, yes.

[4:55:21] Mike Booth, Town Manager for Town of Fishers, stated he is representing the town council in regards to this issue. The town council has stated their concern are the costs. It is the operating costs that concerns them the most. As long as we continue to receive the services that we have under current contract, that is their legal responsibility and their main concern. It is acceptable as long as we can maintain that relationship.

[4:56:47] Sheriff Carter stated the representative from Arcadia could not attend today due to a prior commitment. Arcadia is concerned about the costs. They are concerned that their will be significant costs to the Town of Arcadia, which they simply can not support. Altman asked if they are electing to do animal control on their own? Sheriff Carter stated that would be their option, yes.

[4:57:24] Dillinger stated given the new facility, have we revisited the costs? Mr. Sanders stated no, it will be difficult to know until we know what size facility it is.

[4:58:00] Altman motioned that the commissioners sit down with Paul I. Cripe, look at the plans that have been created and decide with them what we think is feasible and move forward with the design and the facility based on an outside operator. Dillinger asked under the agreement that has beengreed to today? Altman stated yes. We need to design it with the ability to take over operations if necessary. We build it into the design concept. We won't ever run a facility that would not have adoption capabilities for those animals that are not picked up. We would still try to adopt out animals whether we are a government facility or the humane society. It is just a question of how long we afford the opportunity for the animals to be adopted. Both components work. Holt seconded. Holt stated assuming the humane society is the third party operator, it is important that we negotiate an operating agreement with the humane society as soon as possible for that point in time that the existing building is abandoned and the new building is constructed. Throughout this the devil has been in the details. We need to see in black and white that there is a meeting of the minds between the county and the humane society and likewise that all of our municipal partners have an opportunity to see this agreement up front. I know it is fun to build new buildings and the money is sitting in the bank, but I don't think building that building is as important as making sure we are all moving forward together. He has spent a lot of time with Paul I. Cripe and the humane society and Judy Levine in the design phase. He hates to generate any more fees with Cripe until the three of us have a comfort level that we are moving forward with the humane society and they are the third party in this cooperative effort. Dillinger stated he understands what Holt is saying but under Altman's motion we would be working with Cripe to design it so that if we have to do it, we have the facility to do it. Holt stated he understands that, but if the humane society is going to be our partner in this in terms of being the operator, they should sit at the design table. The three of us have never run an animal shelter and Cripe took their direction from the humane society and the master plan from the consultant. For us to sit down and have a void on what the operator thinks is logical does not make sense to him. He would like to know we are moving forward with the humane society and if we are not and we are looking for another operator, then they should sit down with Cripe. Finishing the building design is easy, hard is the document that Mike drafts that we and the humane society can agree to and the municipalities can agree to. Altman stated the humane society has had their input, we have continuity of designers that have heard the input and at this stage she has talked to many people that have gone to Indianapolis because our facility was too small, it was not comfortable, they did not feel comfortable adopting at our facility because of the facility. We need to do a service to the animals in this community and move forward and for the people running it so we have a clean, sanitary, easy to operate facility and we have had plenty of input from the humane society they have been very good with their ideas. We need to design a facility that they can operate or we can operate and move forward. Holt stated this design was done one year ago. When fresh ideas come to the table, things change. Susan Jennings, looking for maximum capacity has said they are spending a lot of money on the outside runs and she was not sure they made sense. A lot more capacity can be made in the building if it is an inside box and you are not doing those runs. That had some pizzazz to it. The humane society needs to be sitting at the table when we are talking to Cripe to say if it will work or not. Holt stated whoever our partner is should be sitting in on the design. Dillinger stated he does not have a problem with them sitting in with us on design, but he agrees with Altman, they have had their input. He does not know why we can't do both. We can direct Mike to draw up the agreement, as we understand it. We could get a copy of the agreement to the humane society and the municipalities. While that is going on we can meet with Cripe and the humane society can have a representative meet with Cripe with us, so we can start the process as well. Holt stated it is important to focus on what the agreement is. We don't need to pay Cripe by the hour to do design work and have folks concerned about details in the building until we know we have an agreement to move forward. Dillinger asked are we not going to have to build a building, regardless? Holt stated we are. I think the initial operator should have a say in that. Altman stated we can't design a signal purpose building, we have to provide for the contingency that the county will run it. Their board may change their decisions, if the partnership does not work we have to have that facility multi-functional. Holt stated he does not disagree. Altman stated we have spent years on this and it is time to move. It is not fair to the people who work out there and the animals that come through, with money sitting there, not to move forward on this. Dillinger asked Altman to restate her motion that if she agrees what he said about how we should go forward to include all of that. Dillinger stated get our agreement, as we understand it, get it to the humane society, get it to our municipal friends and start meeting with Cripe to start redesign work and allow them to have participation in that. Altman accepted that amendment to her motion. Holt seconded the amended motion [5:07:13] Ms. Susan Jennings, resident of Noblesville and former interim Director for the Humane Society, re-emphasized what Holt was saying about bringing the humane society together to the table to build this building. They have been at the table with Cripe for over a year and a half and have not come to agreements on much of anything. She has pointed out to Holt that with her

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

research on the buildings with having visited and talked to building designers on three different locations that this building design will not work. As we both know the humane society has not built a building before and neither has Cripe. Consequently the particular plans to date, they have not agreed on anything. Mr. Holt is correct in saying that you need to decide if these are the partners you are going to be with or if you are going to find another partner, then at that time go ahead with the building. Dillinger stated in our motion it is our intent that they will be our partner unless they disagree with the agreement that they have said they would agree to. Ms. Jennings stated on taking the animals to Wisconsin - Indianapolis Animal Control is doing that already. It is just in one facility, she does not know how many more animals they will be able to take from us. She finds it hard to believe. The cost of taking those animals up there would be astronomical for a group that does not have a positive cash flow in any particular month. She finds that they have to actually commit to euthanizing for space and that is the issue and she does not get the impression, they said they did not want to but they did not say they would. Dillinger stated it will be written in the agreement.

Mr. Howard stated everyone has tiptoed around the concept of pipeline. While we have said we won't let owners bring their animals in, what is happening now is that when the humane society turns them away, they call the police and they bring them in. The concept is the pipeline will have to be open at the front and will have to be the baseline of the agreement and will not be removed without the commissioners telling him to remove it. That is the public health issue. Altman stated the interesting fact that we have to come up with is capacity at that facility. We will have to have an understanding of how many animals we will house at that facility before the gate has to open to make opportunity for the next animal coming in. Dillinger stated the humane society board has to understand that the primary goal of this agreement, from the county and municipalities position is to take care of the obligation the county has on animal control. That is number one. The humane society says they do not want to euthanasia for overcrowding, what happens when you are overcrowded? We can't compromise on the front end of this agreement. Mr. Sanders stated our status is that we don't want to euthanasia for space, we are willing to commit today that we will take all your animals if the county steps up and helps with the new building. We are going out on a limb and committing to you if you step up and commit to a new building. Dillinger asked if they understand that the compromise, in the event it gets overcrowded, can not be on the front end of that agreement. It has to be on something the humane society does. Mr. Sanders stated they are willing to do that up-front agreement. Dillinger stated he is willing to accept that. We will have it in writing. There should be some reporting in the agreement such as financial reports. We need to know that information. Mr. Sanders stated that is fine, we are not hiding anything. Altman stated the concept with the other partners is that everyone is paying for the building through the tax base, it is the operating costs that each entity that is responsible for animal control, if they care to participate will share in that cost. It will have to be a cost sharing arrangement for participation. It is the best we can figure out on doing it at a centralized location that the facility is there, the operating costs are spread out over the participating entities and everyone is welcome to participate. Motion carried unanimously.

Juvenile Detention Center Agreements:

Holt motioned to approve the Retainage Escrow Agreements and contractors agreements with Gaylor and Gradex for site work at the Juvenile Detention Center. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Regional Transit Authority:

Holt motioned to nominate David George to the Governor's appointment to the RTA. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Altman motioned to adjourn. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Correspondence

Notice of Public Hearing - City of Carmel:

South and East of 146th & Keystone Ave. Intersection - Kite Development

Primary Plat Amendment - Cherry Creek Estates, Section 6

Notice of Public Hearing - City of Noblesville:

Jack and Jim Butler

IDEM Proposed Designations for Fine Particles

IDEM Notice of Sewer Permit Applications:

East Haven at Noble West, Section 3A - Noblesville

Loma Court Common Force Main - Fishers

Noblesville Business Park - Noblesville

Reflections at Cumberland Point, Section 2&3 - Noblesville

Clarian North Medical Center - Carmel

Avalon of Fishers, Section 2&3 - Fishers

Avalon of Fishers Amenity Area - Fishers

Community Medical Pavilion - Fishers

S&B Construction - Fishers

Oak Ridge Professional Complex - Westfield

IDEM Notice of Construction Permit Application:

Somerset, Section 2A - Fishers

Sagamore, Sections 5, 6 & 7 - Noblesville

Oak Ridge Professional Complex - Westfield

Avalon of Fishers, Section One E - Fishers

Georgia Road Lift Station and Force Main - Fishers

Bee Camp Lift Station and Force Main - Fishers

The Boulders, Section 1 - Fishers

The Villas @ Timberstone, Section 1 - Fishers

Timberstone, Section 1 - Fishers

Strongbow Gate, Section 2 - Fishers

Watercolors, Section 1 - Fishers

Brooks Park, Section 1 - Fishers

Westbrooke at Geist, Section 1 and 2 - Fishers

Present

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JULY 12, 2004

Christine Altman, Commissioner
Steven C. Dillinger, Commissioner
Control
Steven A. Holt, Commissioner
Robin M. Mills, Auditor
Kim Rauch, Administrative Assistant to Auditor
Fred Swift, Administrative Assistant to Commissioners
Michael A. Howard, Attorney
Doug Carter, Sheriff
Brad Davis, Highway Director
Jim Neal, Highway Engineer
Virginia Hughes, Administrative Assistant to Highway Engineer
Amber Emery, Highway Public Service Representative
Robert Chadwell, Highway Inspector
Steve Broermann, Highway Technical Engineer
Mark Fisher, Highway Technical Engineer
Christopher Burt, Highway Staff Engineer
Tim Knapp, Highway Right-of-Way Specialist
Mike McBride, Small Structure Staff Engineer
Faraz Hahn, Highway Department
Kathy Howard, Highway Department
Bob Davis, Highway Superintendent
Chief
Phil Dunlap, Indianapolis Star
Becki Wise, USI
Jeff Hill, The Corradino Group
Mike Booth, Town of Fishers
George Piper, Daily Times
Floyd Burroughs, FEBA
Richard Albright, Carmel
Larry Dawson, Envoy
John Barbee, Envoy
Diana Lamirand, Ledger
David Wrightsman, Guaranteed Energy Savings

Kyla Sigler, Animal Control
V. Lozette Rodriguiz, Animal

Joy Slovisky, Animal Control
Kim Knight, Animal Control
Jan Padgett, Animal Control
Julie McCullough, Animal Control
Teresa Cotton, Animal Control
Pamela Topping, Animal Control
Susan Jennings, Animal Control
Karen Britton, Animal Control
Kera Slowitsky, Animal Control
Janet McKinney, Animal Control
Derek Falehay, Animal Control
Greg Million, Animal Control
Kerry May, Animal Control
Randi Haley, Animal Control
Jessica L. King, Animal Control
Abe Evans, Animal Control
Gail Pierce, Animal Control
Tim Green, Asst. Carmel Police Chief
Dick Russell, Noblesville Police

John Ditslear, Noblesville Mayor
David Sanders, Humane Society
Steve Nicholas, Humane Society

APPROVED
HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST

Robin M. Mills, Auditor